DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 723 CS 007 086

AUTHOR Morris, Sonia M.
TITLE The Long-Term Effects of Remediation in Reading Over a Four Year Period.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 54p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Federal Programs; Longitudinal Studies; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; Supplementary Education

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine if progress made by primary grade students in the Cranford Public Schools (New Jersey) placed in a Chapter 1 (formerly Title I) remedial reading program was reflected in their classroom performance in terms of (1) report card grades in reading, (2) maintenance of skills within the classroom, (3) placement in supplemental reading programs, and (4) reading achievement test scores. Data were collected through a review of cumulative records and individual student folders for a four-year period. Results indicated that students who began remediation in grade one achieved greater long-term gains than did children who did not begin remediation until grades two or three. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229723

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF REMEDIATION IN READING OVER A FOUR YEAR PERIOD

by

Sonia M. Morris

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sonia M. Morris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in Education at Kean College of New Jersey
April 1983

CS007086

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the long-term effects of remediation in reading over a four year period on the original Chapter I Program participants in the Cranford Public Schools in relation to continued placement in remedial programs, report card grades, and achievement test scores.

Data was compiled and analyzed. Comparisons were made between the three samples investigated. Statistical analysis was completed to determine the significance of the findings.

Results indicated that children who began remediation in grade one achieved greater long-term gains than children who did not begin remediation until grade two or three.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		i
TABLE OF CONTENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		iii
CHAPTER I.	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
CHAPTER III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	31
CHAPTER IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	35
CHAPTER V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY		46
APPENDIX		48

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE I.	ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY FOR LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE	24
TABLE II.	READING GAINS MADE BY TITLE I STUDENTS ACROSS GRADE LEVELS	25
TABLE III.	PRE/POST RESULTS: BSI READING PROJECTS MODEL A-1	27
TABLE IV.	COMPARABILITY OF I.Q. OF SAMPLES I, II, AND III	36
TABLE V.	NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING REMEDIATION IN READING OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD	36
TABLE VI.	DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT CARD GRADES BY NUMBER OF STUDENTS	37
TABLE VII.	DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT CARD GRADES BY PERCENTAGE	38
TABLE VIII.	NUMBER OF STUDENTS ABOVE AND AT OR BELOW THE 50th PERCENTILE	39
TABLE IX.	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ABOVE AND AT OR BELOW THE 50%	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Chapter I, formerly Title I, program has been in existence in the Cranford Public Schools since January, 1978. Results of standardized pre and post-testing have indicated that positive gains have been made by program participants. However, it is noticed that many of these children remain in need of supplemental support from year to year, in spite of positive gains, raising the question of the value of the Chapter I program in terms of improving the childrens' skills so that they can perform successfully within a classroom setting. Since valuable class instruction is being missed while children are receiving supplemental instruction, it is important that these services be proven beneficial and therefore justifiable. Although test scores may show improvement, one must question their value and validity if the child continues to be in need of supplemental support.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What is the effect of supplemental instruction in reading under the Chapter I program on first, second, and third grade students in the Cranford Public Schools over a four year period?

HYPOTHESIS

Students who entered the program as first or second graders in September, 1978, will as a result of early remedial intervention at grade levels where emphasis is placed on developing decoding and word attack skills, be shown to need less supplemental support over a four year period than those who entered the program while enrolled in third grade.

Those students who entered the program as third graders in September, 1978, will be shown to be in need of greater supplemental support over a four year period, due to remediation commencing at a grade level where emphasis shifts from developing decoding and word attack skills to comprehension and skill application.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Chapter I, formerly Title I, programs have been in effect nationwide since 1965, offering supplemental instruction to educationally disadvantaged children. In spite of seventeen years of existence, the effectiveness of Title I has remained questionable. Early evaluation requirements were unspecific, parts of the law were ambiguous, and early data collection was technically lacking.

Recent statistics, employing more sophisticated evaluation procedures have shown substantial evidence that funds are leading to educational results. According to New Jersey Title I Evaluation Reports for 1977-78 through

1979-80 school years, overall reading achievement scores have steadily improved.

District Summary Reports for Cranford's Basic Skills Improvement Program for the 1978-79 through 1981-82 school years have also shown positive gains in reading scores, ranging from a gain of 1.0 to 28.7 norm curve equivalent (NCE) points in grades one, two, and three. But upon reviewing master lists of program participants, it is noticed that in spite of overall positive reading gains, many of the names are recurring over this four year period. It is the aim of this study to determine if the program has or has not made a positive impact on the participants.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study will attempt to determine if progress made due to remediation in reading in the Chapter I program is reflected in the students' classroom performance in terms of 1) report card grades in reading, 2) maintenance of skills within the classroom, 3) placement in supplemental reading programs, and 4) achievement test scores in reading. Data will be collected through review of cumulative records and individual student folders and tabulated on tables and graphs.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Assumptions

The study assumes that standardized test results are valid and that program participants have been objectively

and properly selected for supplemental Chapter I reading instruction based on actual educational needs.

Limitations

The study is limited to the first, second, and third grade students who entered the Chapter I program for supplemental instruction in reading in September, 1978, and are still attending the Cranford Public Schools.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Chapter I:

Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, revising Title I provisions with the intent of eliminating burdensome paperwork, freeing schools of unnecessary federal control, and freeing educational personnel from overly prescriptive regulations.

Educationally disadvantaged (deprived):

Performing below the expected grade level for one's age group.

Program participant:

Any child participating in the Chapter I program for a minimum of one school year.

Title I:

Public-Law 89-10, signed April 11, 1965, to provide financial assistance to local school districts to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

SUMMARY

The analysis of data indicating whether the children can function successfully within the classroom after an initial period of remediation, or whether they remain in need of supplementary support, should aide in assessing if program goals are being met--the primary goal being to improve skills so that the student can perform successfully within the classroom without supplemental support. The conclusions formulated should assist administrators and educators in future program planning and implementation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The importance of determining the short term, as well as long term, effects of remediation in reading, has motivated many researchers to investigate this issue. Many studies have been conducted to search for answers to determine the impact of remedial instruction in reading in relationship to various factors, such as frequency of instruction, pupil:teacher ratio, mental capacity and reading potential, age of participants at commencement of instruction (elementary or secondary), and continuation of growth after termination of intensive treatment. Adult accomplishments of previously reading disabled children have also been studied.

The New Jersey State Department of Education has conducted studies to attempt to determine the effectiveness of its Title I Programs since their inception in 1965, to meet the demand of Congress for positive proof of success and to prove that the enormous emounts of money being spent are not being wasted. Although the purpose of these studies up to now has been to investigate short term gains of program participants, requirements are presently being implemented to measure the sustained effects of remediation.

STUDIES

Mouly and Grant Study

In 1956, G. Mouly and Virginia Grant conducted a study to determine how much growth should be expected of reading disabled children after a period of intensive remediation. Fourth grade pupils who were twelve months or more below their mental age in reading were selected. It should be noted that few were below their chronological age in reading ability, and that at the grade level chosen, independent word attack skills had been fairly established. The results of the study showed a gain of two months in reading age for each month of remediation.[1]

Fry Study

Edward Fry conducted a study in 1959 at the Loyola University Reading Clinic. His purpose was twofold; to determine an improvement in reading ability as measured by the "Standardized Oral Reading Paragraphs" by William S. Gray, and to poll parents on their opinion of whether they felt remediation had been beneficial or detrimental to their children. He chose as his sample 202 children, grades two through twelve with an average I.Q. of 99.6, who were reading an average of 3.12 years below grade expectancy. The subjects were given remediation on a two to one teacher:pupil ratio for a total

---

[1]G.J.Mouly and Virginia Grant. "A Study of Growth to be Expected of Retarded Readers," Journal of Educational Research 49 (February, 1956), 461-465.

of fifteen months--two hours per week during the regular school year and one hour and twenty minutes per day for five weeks during the summer. His results showed that the children made an average gain of one year per session (regular year or summer), although of the sample 20% made only negligible gains and 5% were unsuccessful.

Of the sixty responses to the parent opinion poll, 81% felt that their childrens' reading ability had improved greatly or somewhat.

Also noteworthy, 92% of parents polled noticed a more positive attitude in their children in reading, peer relationships, and attitudes towards school.[2]

Bliesmer Study

Emergy P. Bliesmer analyzed three methods of evaluating progress to determine short term effects of remedial instruction; determination of gains by the usual post minus pre-test difference, comparison of remedial progress gains with average pre-remedial gains, and determination of the difference between reading potential and reading achievement levels at the beginning and end of the remedial program. He studied eighty-one reading disabled pupils in grades four through eight, divided into two groups which received remediation two hours per week for seven months. Group A consisted of forty children in grades four through eight who were test-

[2]Edward Fry. "A Reading Clinic Reports Its Results and Methods," Journal of Educational Research 52 (April, 1959), 311-313.

with the Stanford Binet individually, the Gates Reading tests and the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Group B, forty-one children in grades four through seven, were given the same tests, but the Gates Reading test was not included in their analysis, the Stanford Binet was administered as a group, and the California Test of Mental Maturity was included. Cumulative records for all children were reviewed for data on pre-remedial growth. Fry concluded from his study that all three methods of evaluation demonstrated program effectiveness, although greater gains were shown using the post minus pre-test method than reporting gains in terms of reading potential levels.[3]

Robinson and Smith Study

In 1958, Helen M. Robinson and Helen K. Smith conducted a follow-up study of the 44 original clinic cases of the University of Chicago Laboratory School, ten years after initial diagnosis. Originally, the clients, ranging in age from seven to eighteen (mostly eight years old) were an average of one or more years behind grade expectancy with an average I.Q. of 120. Some had had remediation in the clinic, some in their classrooms, and several had had none. The researchers concluded, through use of personal and telephone interviews and questionnaires, that the majority of previously reading disabled pupils could be rehabilitated

---

[3]Emery P. Bliesmer. "Evaluating Progress in Remedial Reading Programs," Reading Teacher 15 (March, 1962), 344-350.

enough to obtain a formal education and fulfill occupational ambitions. They also determined that these students could become avid readers if their problems were corrected before becoming too overwhelming or persistent. Of the sample studied, 41 had completed high school and 31 had graduated from, or were attending college. A former non-reader had graduated with honors, while two others were pursuing doctorates.[4]

Lovell, Johnson, and Platts Study

K. Lovell, L. R. Johnson, and D. Platts reported on 284 British pupils who had had small group or individualized reading instruction. The students, average age ten, had an average I.Q. of 90 and were reading at a primary level prior to remediation. The study showed that during remediation the students made gains two to three times the rate of the normal student. A follow-up of these children two years later demonstrated that their rate of growth had decreased after termination of remediation. The children continued to make progress, but at a rate slower than their growth in age, therefore causing them to fall behind their normal peers. The researchers concluded that growth in reading ability increases during intensive remediation, but fall behind

---

[4]Helen M. Robinson and Helen K. Smith. "Reading Clinic Cases - Ten Years After," Elementary School Journal 63 (October, 1962), 22-27.

without continued support.[5]

Lovell, Byrne, and Richardson Study

A further study of the educational progress of children who had received remedial instruction was conducted by K. Lovell, C. Byrne, and B. Richardson. They investigated the continued progress sixteen months or more later of 240 remedial students who had made gains of two years during approximately one year of intensive remediation. As in a previous study by Lovell, it was found that once intensive remediation was terminated, growth continued, but at a much slower rate than previously.[6]

Balow Study

Bruce Balow analyzed a study of three groups of students attending the Psycho-Educational Clinic at the University of Minnesota to determine immediate growth in reading skills, as well as continued growth after the termination of intensive tutoring. All of the children studied were middle to low middle class pupils, approximately at a fifth to sixth grade level, with an average I.Q. range, functioning two to three years below in reading. The subjects demonstrated moderate adjustment and emotional problems, low

---

[5]K. Lovell, L. R. Johnson, and D. Platts. "A Summary of a Study of the Reading Ages of Children Who Had Been Given Remedial Teaching," British Journal of Educational Psychology 32 (February, 1962), 66-71.

[6]K. Lovell, C. Byrne, and B. Richardson. "A Further Study of the Educational Progress of Children Who Had Received Remedial Instruction, "British Journal of Educational Psychology 33 (February, 1963), 3-9.

self-image, and distractability. Prior to remediation, the children had been working at half the rate of the normal pupils. After two or three hours per day of instruction for twenty days, groups one and two were progressing respectively at rates twelve and nine times greater than their rates prior to remediation.

The researcher concluded that continued growth was dependent upon continued attention to the problem as a result of his findings in a follow-up study of these children thirteen months after intensive treatment. Group one, which received no further tutoring, did not lose their skills, but also did not show continued growth. On the other hand, groups two and three, which continued to receive supportive help--one hour or less per week--continued to show growth greater than that before tutoring.[7]

Preston and Yarington Study

Information on fifty former clinic cases was obtained through telephone interviews by Ralph C. Preston and David Yarington, eight years after their initial diagnosis. Originally, all had been doing inferior school work and all but four had had some type of remediation in reading. In making comparisons with statistics on the national population, they found the following: 1) the percentage attending

---

[7]Bruce Balow. "Long Term Effects of Remedial Reading Instruction," Reading Teacher 18 (April, 1965), 581-586.

college was not significantly different from that of the national population, although none of the fifty pursued graduate studies, 2) the percentage entering white collar occupations was not significantly different, and 3) the high school dropout rate was not significantly different. The only significant difference was found in the area of retention--over two-thirds of the sample had repeated one to three grades throughout their school years, while only sixteen percent of the national population repeat one or more grades. The researchers concluded from their findings that after eight years, educational and vocational roles comparable to those of their peers in the general population had been fulfilled, although achievement of these goals came about more slowly due to retention. It was also noted that the subjects had no higher aspirations after college, therefore narrowing their vocational possibilities.[8]

Buerger Study

Theodore Buerger tested three hypotheses concerning the short and long term effects of remedial reading instruction. He sought to prove that students receiving remediation would make immediate post-remedial gains and would make greater long term gains than those receiving no remediation. He also hoped that they would demonstrate more positive long

---

[8]Ralph C. Preston and David J. Yarington. "Status of Fifty Retarded Readers Eight Years After Reading Clinic Diagnosis," Journal of Reading 11 (November, 1967), 122-129.

term attitudes than the control group. Long term effects on educational progress and attitudes were studied in terms of letter grades, test results, and the students' own opinions. Buerger used as his sample a group of seventy-two underachieving children in grades three through seven at the Lakewood Public Schools' Reading Center. Each received an average of fifty or more hours of remedial reading instruction over a period of 15.8 to 17.2 months. A control group of seventy-two underachieving children received no remediation. Buerger found that his subjects made immediate post-remedial gains as he had predicted, but no significant long term effectiveness was found up to 5.6 years after intensive tutoring in terms of letter grades in English and Social Studies, test results measuring vocabulary or comprehension skills, or the number of retentions. Noteworthy, in their own opinions, the students felt that remedial reading had been of value to them, and significantly less problems were reported by them than the control group as measured by the SRA Youth Inventory.[9]

Rawson Study

Margaret Rawson investigated the adult accomplishments of fifty-six mentally superior males who had attended The School in Rose Valley, Moylan, Pennsylvania, eighteen to thirty-five years after their initial testing. Of the 56,

---

[9]Theodore Buerger. "A Follow-up of Remedial Reading Instruction," Reading Teacher 21 (January, 1968), 329-334.

only twenty in the "low language" group could be considered clinical cases. She found that the adult accomplishments of the twenty to be comparable to the accomplishments of the other thirty-six. All had graduated high school, and eighteen from college--fourteen of them with graduate degrees and some with doctorates.[10]

Cashdan and Pumfrey Study

Asher Cashdan and P. D. Pumfrey reached the conclusion that there were no significant differences between the experimental and the control groups in a number of areas concerning the effects of the remedial teaching of reading. They studied thirty-six junior school boys, divided into three groups of twelve. Remediation was given in small groups of four to six for thirty to sixty minute sessions twice a week to Group A and only once a week to Group B, while Group C served as a control. The researchers concluded that the number of sessions per week demonstrated no significant difference in reading ability. Groups A and B showed no significantly higher attainment on criterion tests than the control and demonstrated no significantly higher attainment after a two year period. There was also no significant difference in the students' attitudes towards reading after two years, although attitudes of the two remedial groups were near the favorable

[10]Margaret Rawson, Developmental Language Disability: Adult Accomplishments of Dyslexic Boys, Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins Press, 1968.

end as measured by Williams Attitude Scale.[11]

Klosterman Study

Sister Rita Klosterman hypothesized that fourth grade students who received supplemental tutoring in reading would make greater gains than those who received only classroom instruction and also sought to study whether individual or small group instruction proved most beneficial. Students were tutored by college students majoring in Elementary Education, four days per week, for thirty minute sessions, during a six month period from October to March. Data was based on the difference between pre and post test results from the California Reading Test, Form W. The results indicated that children receiving individual instruction did not make gains significantly greater than those receiving small group instruction, although both individual and small group made significantly greater gains in vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading than those children instructed within the classroom.[12]

Steirnagle Study

Edward Steirnagle conducted a five year survey of the effectiveness of Title I remedial reading programs in El Paso, Texas, when it was discovered that after the first year and

---

[11]Asher Cashdan and P. D. Pumfrey. "Some Effects of the Remedial Teaching of Reading," Educational Research 11 (1969), 138-142.

[12]Sister Rita Kosterman. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Sturctured Reading Program," Reading Teacher 24 (November, 1970), 159-162.

a half only negligible gains--an average of six months--had been made by the 801 program participants. He analyzed the existing program in light of the following factors: 1) appropriateness of instructional materials, 2) competency of teachers, 3) adequacy of facilities, 4) pupil:teacher ratios, and 5) methods of screening and selecting participants. Inaccuracies in all areas were corrected; inappropriate materials purchased in haste at the start of the program were discarded and replaced, teachers were trained in remedial techniques, and it was seen to that facilities were adequate. The teacher:pupil ratio was reduced from ten to five and instructional sessions to one hour per day. I.Q. scores and the degree of reading deficiency were the criteria used for screening pupils. The "El Paso" formula was developed to arrive at a "reading index" for those students lacking language skills. The results of the changes were increased gains in reading for the 1967-68 school year as shown by the difference between pre and post-test scores. Of the students serviced, 288 gained four years, 41 gained five years, seven gained six years, and six actually made gains of 7 to 7.5 years. It was also noted that students receiving tutoring in groups of five made greater gains than those tutored on a 2:1 or 1:1 basis. As a result, group size was increased to eight for the 1968-69 school year. Although test results showed that less dramatic, but still significant, gains had

been made, almost three hundred more students received services.[13]

Cashdan, Pumfrey, and Lunzer Study

A study on the short term effects of remediation was conducted by Asher Cashdan, P. D. Pumfrey and E. A. Lunzer with the purpose of arriving at generalizations which could be applied to practical remedial situations. 1227 children, ages eight to approximately eleven (average age nine), who were an average of three years behind their age expectancy in reading were selected. They received approximately eleven months of tutoring once a week, individually or in groups of up to sixteen. Methods of instruction, selection of students, and frequency of testing were not controlled for, and no follow-up was done. After determining the difference between pre and post-test results, the following conclusions were made: 1) the initial reading level of the girls was significantly higher than that of the boys, 2) younger children made greater gains than older children, 3) amount of gain was proportionate to the amount of tutoring--the more attendances, the greater the gain, 4) groups of one to six made comparable gains, but when group size was larger than six, gains were significantly less, 5) I.Q. was unrelated to improvement, and 6) there

---

[13]Edward Steirnagle. "A Five-Year Summary of a Remedial Reading Program," Reading Teacher 24 (March, 1971), 537-543.

was an average gain of twenty-one months for the eleven months of instruction.[14]

Durost Study

Walter Durost, adjunct Professor of Education at the University of New Hampshire, summarized the meaning of "accountability" as it is related to national Title I Programs, in his article on the subject in the Reading Teacher, January, 1971. The United States Office of Education has taken the position that it is essential to prove that the enormous amounts of money being spent are not being wasted and that positive proof of success must be demonstrated. Pertinent questions must be answered before success can be proved and programs validly be considered beneficial. Evaluation procedures must be adequate, accurate, and technically sound. It must be asked whether the students selected are those with the greatest need. Proper identification through careful diagnosis is needed, as well as consideration of the reading potential for each child. Testing instruments should be valid, highly reliable, and used as intended. Data collection and processing should be technically accurate on statewide and national levels. It must also be determined whether the gains in reading shown by test results are indicative of actual reading ability and performance. Accountability can only be

---

[14] Asher Cashdan, P. D. Pumfrey, and E. A. Lunzer. "Children Receiving Remedial Teaching in Reading," Educational Research 13 (1971), 98-105.

measured once these factors have been taken into account.[15]

Spache Study

George D. Spache reviewed and summarized the findings of various researchers in Chapter Twelve of his text Diagnosing and Correcting Reading Disabilities, dealing with the long term effects of remediation. He concluded that during intensive treatment gains are commonly double of those normally expected during any given period of time, but the progress made during treatment is not positively related to long term effects, nor to spontaneous growth after remediation is terminated. He agreed with Balow and Collins that for the best long term results, contact with the pupil (and parent if possible) should be continued approximately once a week for support after the termination of intensive treatment. He concluded that as the initial reading status of the child is directly related to the gains achieved, it is reasonable to select higher scoring children with less need, rather than those with the greatest need, as less treatment time would be needed to return the child to a classroom setting, which is the ultimate goal of most reading programs. In this manner, more children could receive supplementary services. He also stated that the determination must be made which grade level of children to service; remediation is important in the primary grades where reading attitudes and pattern

---

[15]Walter N. Durost. "Accountability: the Task, the Tools, and the Pitfalls," Reading Teacher 24 (January, 1971), 291-304.

of success or failure are formed, as well as in the elementary and secondary grades, where students tend to respond more readily to remediation, therefore possibly showing greater long term profit. Emotional factors were also found to be of importance in determining the eventual outcome of remediation in reading.[16]

Koffler Study

Stephen Koffler analyzed New Jersey's Title I Programs for the 1975-76 school year to determine the distribution and effect of dispersal and usage of funds on immediate short term educational achievement. Data was based on results of the 1975 New Jersey Educational Assessment Program in grades four, seven, and ten. Districts were divided according to eight variables contributing to socioeconomic status, which resulted in ten District Factor Groupings ranging from A (lowest) to J (highest). Communication (reading and language experience) and computation programs were analyzed for cost of program per pupil, average instructional salary, pupil: teacher ratio, and percentage of Title I participation. Results in reading programs found that average scores decreased as cost per pupil and pupil:teacher ratios increased. The study concluded that schools with small, well-paid staff with many students did the poorest and suggested more staff

---

[16]George D. Spache, Diagnosing and Correcting Reading Disabilities (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), 325-342.

with lower pupil:teacher ratios.[17]

New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1976

The Title I Office of the New Jersey State Department of Education tabulated achievement data for the 1975-76 school year in language experience (reading) for the districts which reported results in terms of grade equivalent scores, as this was the method used by the majority of local districts. The majority of districts reported gains of seven months or more using post minus pre-test differences, although gains as high as 10.1 months were also reported. As there were a variety of measurement instruments and testing schedules used by local districts, it was found that sound conclusions regarding the impact of Title I programs could not be drawn. Due to programmatic inconsistencies and the problems inherent with the use of grade equivalent scores, the main conclusion drawn was the need for the State Department of Education to foster efforts to improve evaluation procedures. To this end a survey was conducted to determine the types of testing instruments used and the types of scores being reported, so that the evaluation and reporting system could be revised.[18]

---

[17] Stephen L. Koffler, An Analysis of ESEA Title I Data in New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

[18] New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1976, New Jersey State Department of Education, 11-13.

New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1978

For the 1977-78 school year, achievement data was once again analyzed in terms of grade equivalent scores, as the reporting of grade equivalent scores was still in the process of being phased out. Close review of achievement information by technical consultants indicated that many districts were submitting incomplete data inaccurately aggregated. Inaccurate information was not used in the final analysis and guidelines and reporting forms were redesigned to prevent similar problems in fiscal year 1979. It was also determined that districts would be required to report all scores in terms of norm curve equivalents in the future.

According to the grade equivalent data tabulated, most participants demonstrated substantial immediate gains. Of the 18,072 students statewide who received remediation in reading, 65.14% demonstrated a post minus pre-test gain of seven months or more, and 47.18% made gains of ten months or more. Data is tabulated by grade level in Table I.[19]

---

[19] Eric D. Olandt and Margaret Hoppe, New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1978 New Jersey State Department of Education, Summer 1980, 16-20.

TABLE I

ACHIEVEMENT DATA SUMMARY FOR LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE

Grade	Total Number of Students	Percent with Seven Months or More	Percent With Ten Months or More
1	2,010	61.44%	43.98%
2	4,275	66.03%	45.35%
3	3,499	65.33%	45.21%
4	2,661	64.97%	45.92%
5	2,139	63.76%	47.03%
6	1,453	65.17%	49.13%
7	580	67.75%	59.82%
8	544	66.54%	55.51%
9	516	74.03%	61.82%
10	251	68.92%	99.36%
11	109	58.71%	49.54%
12	35	45.71%	25.71%
Totals	18,072		

National Assessment for Educational Progress Study

In 1979, the National Institute of Education reported that Title I funds were in fact supplementing, not supplanting, educational programs, and concluded that funds were reaching targeted areas and leading to educational results. The National Assessment for Educational Progress reported what they termed as significant gains during the ten year period

from 1970-1980. The performance of Southeastern nine year olds in reading (the focus of three-quarters of Title I projects) improved 7.5%. Rural and disadvantaged urban children made gains of 6% and 5.2% respectively. Nationwide, black nine year olds demonstrated gains of 9.9%.[20]

Further historical success claimed by Title I Reading Programs is tabulated in Table II, representing short term immediate gains.[21]

TABLE II

READING GAINS MADE BY TITLE I STUDENTS ACROSS GRADE LEVELS

School Year	Pre (NCE)	Post (NCE)	Gain (NCE)	Pre %	Post %	Gain %
1977-78	40.1	43.9	+3.8	31.9	38.6	+ 6.7
1978-79	33.5	41.1	+7.6	21.7	33.6	+11.9
1979-80	36.7	46.1	+9.4	26.0	43.0	+17.0

[20] Jeanne K. Britell. "New Title I Fashioned Out of Controversy," New York Times, November 15, 1981.

[21] Achievement in Basic Skills Improvement, 1981, New Jersey State Department of Education, April, 1981.

New Jersey Basic Skills Improvement
Program Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year, 1981

Student achievement data for the 85,414 students receiving supplementary instruction in reading indicated a general statewide pattern of improvement across grade levels beyond that which could be expected without the program. The data used for this analysis was obtained by determining student improvement via achievement gains by comparison of actual performance after treatment with expected non-treatment performance. The amount of growth was mathematically computed in terms of norm curve equivalents (NCE's) which were converted to percentile ranks for national comparisons. Data was also tabulated to account for differences in evaluation strategies such as model used (A-1 - norm-referenced test or C-1 - regression formula) and testing schedule.

Results in reading programs revealed gains of 3.4 NCE points in grade twelve, to 9.7 NCE points in grade two for local districts using model A-1 with a Fall to Spring testing schedule. It was noted that post-test means in grades two through nine were at or above the 30th national percentile. Initial reading status as measured by pre-test results was also greater in the elementary, rather than secondary grades. Results in grades two through twelve are tabulated in Table III.[22]

---

[22]Margaret R. Hoppe. FY'81 Annual Evaluation Report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Improvement Program, New Jersey State Department of Education, May, 1982.

TABLE III

PRE/POST RESULTS: BSI READING PROJECTS
MODEL A-1
FALL/SPRING TESTING SCHEDULE

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest NCE Mean (No Treatment Expectation)	Posttest NCE Mean	NCE Gain
2	15,449	34.4	44.1	9.7
3	16,057	34.8	43.9	9.1
4	15,910	35.8	41.4	5.6
5	16,004	34.2	40.7	6.5
6	14,556	34.9	41.8	6.9
7	13,226	35.4	40.4	5.0
8	15,576	35.0	39.4	4.4
9	11,430	33.5	38.7	5.2
10	9,796	33.2	37.0	3.8
11	7,763	31.4	35.3	3.9
12	6,001	30.0	33.4	3.4

Evaluation and Sustained Gains - New Chapter I Program Requirements

In order to examine project effects over time, Congress included in the Education Amendments of 1978 a requirement for local districts to measure the sustained gains of former Title I students at least once every three years. It called for a measurement instrument to be administered a minimum of twelve months after initial pre-testing. Local districts had the flexibility to select the population to be studied, the

aspects of the program to be investigated, and the evaluation design to be used. But no requirement was made for reporting these results to the State Departments of Education.[23] Therefore, it was found that although districts included the procedures to be used in their evaluation designs, often they were in fact never implemented.

The reporting aspect has become a new monitoring requirement for the future, to document whether improved performance is actually sustained once remediation is terminated. Districts should use the following procedures for implementation: 1) define the program aspects to be studied, i.e.: instructional setting, amount of instructional time, 2) determine the population to be studied (grade level, subject area), 3) develop a three-year schedule, 4) implement this schedule, 5) adjust existing data management system to match three testing points per student for technical validity, 6) institute controls (correct testing procedures), and 7) analyze results for technical errors and correct.[24]

---

[23] Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I Policy Manual, Chapter 10 - Evaluation, U.S. Department of Education, December 22, 1980, 18-19.

[24] Dr. Margaret Hoppe. Lecture on "Evaluation and Sustained Gains," NJAFPA Mini-Conference, November 30, 1982.

SUMMARY

Studies of the short-term effects of remediation in reading by various researchers have generally shown that substantial growth occurs during intensive treatment and that immediate post-remedial gains are made. The prognosis for long-term effects however, has not been as optimistic. The majority of studies concerned with the long-term effects of remedial reading instruction have found that the growth rate achieved during intensive treatment is not sustained over time. Adult accomplishments of previously reading disabled students, as well as educational and occupational goals, when compared to the national population, were not significantly different from their normal peers. Although attitudes towards reading were not significantly different from their peers on a long-term basis, students in most cases felt in their own opinions that remediation had been of value to them. The number of retentions experienced by remedial students was significantly higher than that of the normal population, indicating that the achievement of goals came about more slowly. It was also indicated that emotional factors played a part in the eventual outcome of the students' progress.

The evaluation of Title I reading programs, specifically, has indicated that gains have been made across all grade levels, although the possibility exists that early results are questionnable due to the comparisons of grade equivalent scores, as well as technically lacking evaluation

procedures. Although the gains thusfar reported have been of short-term effects, procedures are in the process of being implemented to study the sustained effects of remediation over time.

George D. Spache summarized the remediation of reading disabilities by making an analogy to the common cold; since the exact cause is unknown, "treatment is intended only to relieve the annoying symptoms and to prevent the progress of the infection (?) into more complicated ailments." We, as educators, provide temporary relief and support to the student, to help him return to the classroom under more favorable circumstances. As remedial reading is supportive, not curative, it should be expected that the student will need continued support from time to time throughout his school years. "We may not be able to change the pattern of reading problems for many cases, but we can certainly help to make school life more tolerable."[25]

---

[25]George D. Spache, Diagnosing and Correcting Reading Disabilities (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), 340-341.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Results of previous research studies concerning the long-term effects of remediation in reading have generally indicated that the growth rate achieved during intensive treatment is not sustained over time. Students have been shown to have the need to return for remediation periodically for support.

The Chapter I (formerly Title I) Program has been operating in the Cranford Public Schools for five years, since January, 1978. No previous studies have been done in the district determining whether or not gains made during initial treatment are sustained, or whether, as previous studies have shown, continued support is needed. The original program participants were chosen for the study, as they could be tracked over the greatest length of time.

The study has significance to educators and administrators in future program planning and implementation.

PROCEDURES USED

A form was developed in order for the researcher to systematically and uniformly compile data on the original Chapter I participants who received supplemental instruction in reading. The researcher visited the schools in which the

subjects were presently in attendance and reviewed cumulative record and report cards and individual student folders to obtain data on achievement test scores, report card grades, and program placement over a four year period. The data was then compiled and compared between each sample.

SOURCES AND METHODS OF GATHERING DATA

The data on the original Title I participants was gathered at each Cranford school in which the subjects were now in attendance. These included Livingston, Hillside, and Orange Avenue Schools, and St. Michael's School. The original population, chosen as they could be tracked over the longest period of time, consisted of 9 fifth (originally first) graders, 20 sixth (originally second) graders, and 7 seventh (originally third) grade students. The study was limited to those original participants who were still attending school in Cranford. The researcher devised a form and used this to compile information on individual students. Cumulative record cards, cumulative report cards, and individual student folders were reviewed for information on achievement test scores, report card grades in reading, and placement in remedial reading programs, respectively. Master lists of Title I participants from September, 1978, to the present were reviewed for placement in Title I reading programs. Remedial reading teachers' schedules from the 1978-79 school year to the present were reviewed for placement in remedial programs. It was assumed by the researcher that

achievement test scores, from the Stanford Achievement Test, were valid. The subjective differences in grading styles between different teachers was not accounted for when recording data on reading report card grades.

Once data was obtained on all original program participants, it was reviewed and analyzed by the researcher. The information was compared between each sample for each area reviewed - achievement test scores, reading report card grades, and placement in remedial programs - over a four year period up to the present.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENTS USED

The form developed by the researcher separated information for each year, beginning with the 1978-79 school year, through the child's present status for the 1982-83 school year. For each year, data included achievement test scores in reading, reading report card grades, and whether or not the child was receiving remedial reading instruction. Achievement test scores were obtained from results of the Stanford Achievement Test and reported in terms of national percentiles for vocabularly, comprehension, and total reading. Report card grades for the fourth marking period were recorded since at this point the child had received a full year of reading instruction.

SUMMARY

The data obtained on the progress made by the original Chapter I participants over a four year period ending with their present status was compiled and comparisons between each sample were made. The information that was obtained is presented and analyzed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The presentation and analysis of data are reported and discussed in this chapter. Data is presented through the use of talbes and textual discussion. The presentation of data has been divided into four categories: comparability of original populations, placement in remedial reading programs, report card grades, and achievement test restuls. Comparisons are made between Samples I, II, and III over a four year period, beginning with the 1978-79 school year and ending with the present school year.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Comparability of Original Populations

Statistical calculations were completed to determine the comparability of the students in Samples I, II, and III, based on intelligence quotients from the Otis-Lennon Test administered in grade 3. Statistical analysis as shown in Table IV revealed that there was no significant difference between the three sample populations.

TABLE IV

COMPARABILITY OF ORIGINAL POPULATION BY I.Q.

	N	Mean	SD	t	
Sample I	9	98.5	3.84		
Sample II	20	101.95	1.81	.971	<.01 level of significance
Sample I	9	98.5	3.84		
Sample III	7	102.57	2.14	.890	<.01 level of significance
Sample II	20	101.95	1.81		
Sample III	7	102.57	2.14	.189	<.01 level of significance

Program Placement

Analysis of the data as seen in Table V concerning placement in remedial reading programs indicates that the students in Sample I who started remediation in grade one, after four years, only 22.2% remain in need of remediation.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING REMEDIATION IN READING OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD

School Year	Sample I	%	Sample II	%	Sample III	%
1978-79	9	100%	20	100%	7	100%
1979-80	6	66.6%	10	50%	6	85%
1980-81	3	33.3%	9	45%	5	71.4%
1981-82	4	44.4%	8	40%	3	42.8%
1982-83	2	22.2%	10	50%	3	42.8%

Data indicates that of those students in Sample II who started remediation in grade two, 50% still remain in need of remediation after four years, and of those who started remediation in grade three (Sample III) 42.8% are still receiving remedial instruction after a four year period. It should be noted that the students in Samples II and III had received no prior remediation in grades one or two.

Report Card Grades

Report card grades of three Samples were analyzed. For the school years 1978-79 through 1981-82, fourth (final) marking period grades were reported, while report card grades in reading for February, 1983 (second marking period) were used for the 1982-83 school year as these were the most recent grades available to indicate current performance.

Analysis of the data as shown in Tables VI and VII indicated that the children in Sample I received a higher percentage of letter grades of B of C four years later

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT CARD GRADES
BY NUMBER OF STUDENTS

		Sample I				Sample II				Sample III				
School Year	S/G	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	F
1978-79	8	-	-	1	-	-	14	5	1	-	3	4	-	-
1979-80	-	-	6	1	2	2	6	12	-	-	1	6	-	-
1980-81	-	-	5	4	-	2	9	7	2	-	2	4	1	-
1981-82	-	1	3	5	-	-	6	9	5	-	3	3	1	-
1982-83	-	-	4	5	-	-	6	13	1	-	3	-	3	-

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT CARD GRADES BY PERCENTAGE

School Year	S/G	Sample I				Sample II				Sample III				
		A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	F
1978-79	88.8	-	-	11.1	-	-	70	25	5	-	42.8	57.1	-	-
1979-80	-	-	66.6	11.1	22.2	10	30	60	-	-	14.2	85.7	-	-
1980-81	-	-	55.5	44.4	-	10	45	35	10	-	28.5	57.1	14.2	-
1981-82	-	11.1	33.3	55.5	-	-	30	45	25	-	42.8	42.8	14.2	-
1982-83	-	-	44.4	55.5	-	-	30	65	5	-	42.8	-	42.8	14.2

than the children in either Samples II or III, and none of the students in Sample I received a letter grade of D.

In Sample II, 5% currently received a letter grade of D and in Sample III 42.8% had received a D, while 14.2% in Sample III received a grade of F.

Achievement Test Results

Data on achievement test results reported in Table VIII were obtained from results of the Stanford Achievement Test administered as part of the district testing program. Criteria was based on the 50th national percentile.

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ABOVE AND AT OR BELOW THE 50%

	Sample I		Sample II		Sample III	
School Year	Above 50%	At or Below 50%	Above 50%	At or Below 50%	Above 50%	At or Below 50%
1978-79	8	1	7	13	1	6
1979-80	6	3	14	6	2	5
1980-81	4	5	11	9	3	4
1981-82	6	3	10	10	1	6

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ABOVE AND AT OR BELOW THE 50th PERCENTILE

School Year	Sample I		Sample II		Sample III	
	Above 50%	At or Below 50%	Above 50%	At or Below 50%	Above 50%	At or Below 50%
1978-79	88.8	11.1	35	65	14.2	85.7
1979-80	66.6	33.3	70	30	28.5	71.4
1980-81	44.4	55.5	55	45	42.8	57.1
1981-82	66.6	33.3	50	50	14.2	85.7

Analysis of the data showed that of the children in Sample I, 16.6% more were above the 50% than those in Sample II, and 52.4% more were above the 50% than in Sample III. Statistical analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between Sample I and Samples II and III using the chi formula, indicating $x^2 = 13.24$, <.01 level of significance.

Analysis of Sample II showed that 35.8% more were above the 50th percentile than in Sample III. This was not a significant difference as $x^2 = 2.73$.

SUMMARY

The data were presented and analyzed in this chapter through the use of tables and textual discussion.

Statistical analysis indicated that there was no significant difference in learning potential between the three Samples.

The percentage of children still in need of remediation after a four year period was less for those children in Sample I than those in Samples II or III. It was indicated that the children in Sample I were presently receiving a higher percentage of B and C report card grades than those in Samples II and III. There were also significantly more children in Sample I above the 50th national percentile than in Samples II or III after a four year period.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the study, the procedures used, and the results of the investigation are reviewed in this chapter.

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the study was to determine the long-term effects of remediation in reading on the original Chapter I participants--first, second and third graders, over a four year period. It was hypothesized that those students who began remediation as first graders would demonstrate greater long-term gains than students beginning remediation in grades two or three, in terms of continued need for remediation, report card grades, and achievement test results. The conclusions formulated should be useful to administrators and educators in future program planning and implementation.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

A form was devised and used to systematically record information on the population being studied. The researcher visited each school in which the students were presently in attendance and reviewed cumulative record and report cards, individual student folders, master lists of Title I participants, and remedial reading teachers' schedules to

obtain information on placement in remedial reading programs, report card grades, and achievement test results over a four year period ending with the 1982-83 school year. The data was compiled and comparisons were made between each sample. Statistical analyses were completed to determine the significance of the data.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The data was analyzed and conclusions were drawn in each area.

It was concluded in the area of placement in remedial reading programs that those students who began remediation in grade one were in less need of continued supplemental support at the end of a four year period, than those children who did not begin remediation until grades two or three. However, data indicated that those who began remediation in grade three were in less need of continued support than those who began remediation in grade two.

Analysis of the distribution of report card grades in reading indicated the children who began remediation in grade one received a higher percentage of letter grades of B or C at the end of a four year period than those children who began remediation in grades two or three. Children who began remediation in grade two also had a higher percentage of B and C letter grades than the children who did not begin remediation until grade three.

Data on the percentage of children above the 50th national percentile on achievement test results after a four year period indicated a significant difference at the .01 level of significance between children who began remediation in grade one and those who began in grades two or three. There was no significant difference between the scores of children who began in grades two or three.

It is concluded that in all areas, children who began remediation in grade one made greater long-term gains after a four year period than children not beginning remediation until grades two or three.

IMPLICATIONS

It is concluded as a result of this investigation that it is advantageous to commence remediation in the first grade, where emphasis is placed on developing basic reading skills in order to obtain greater long-term effects. The results of this study will assist administrators and educators in future program planning and implementation, and in determining the grade levels in which to place the emphasis of remedial programs. It would be beneficial to conduct further investigations at other grade levels to determine the continued long-term effects throughout the childrens' educational years.

SUMMARY

This investigation has indicated that long-term effects of remediation in reading are better sustained the earlier remediation is commenced in order to meet the ultimate goal of remediation--to improve skills so that performance can be maintained within the classroom without supplemental support. It is of significance to administrators and educators in the planning of future remedial programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES

Balow, Bruce. "Long Term Effects of Remedial Reading Instruction." Reading Teacher, 18 (April, 1965), 581-586.

Bliesmer, Emery P. "Evaluating Progress in Remedial Reading Programs." Reading Teacher, 15 (March, 1962), 344-350.

Britell, Jenne K. "New Title I Fashioned Out of Controversy." New York Times, November 15, 1981.

Buerger, Theodore A. "A Follow-up of Remedial Reading Instruction." Reading Teacher, 21 (January, 1968), 329-334.

Cashdan, Asher and P. D. Pumfrey." Some Effects of the Remedial Teaching of Reading." Educational Research, 11 (1969), 138-142.

Cashdan, Asher, P. D. Pumfrey, and E. A. Lunzer. "Children Receiving Remedial Teaching in Reading." Educational Research, 13 (1971), 98-105.

Durost, Walter N. "Accountability: the Task, the Tools, and the Pitfalls." Reading Teacher, 24 (January, 1971), 291-304.

Fry, Edward. "A Reading Clinic Reports Its Results and Methods." Journal of Educational Research, 52 (April, 1959), 311-313.

Hoppe, Margaret R. FY'81 Annual Evaluation Report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Improvement Program. New Jersey State Department of Education, May, 1982.

_____. "Evaluation and Sustained Grains." Lectore at NJAFPA Mini-Conference, November 30, 1982.

Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." Reading Teacher, 24 (November, 1970), 159-162.

Koffler, Stephen L. An Analysis of ESEA Title I Data in New Jersey. New Jersey State Department of Education, 1976.

REFERENCES (CONTINUED)

Lovell, K., L. R. Johnson, and D. Platts. "A Summary of a Study of the Reading Ages of Children Who Had Been Given Remedial Teaching." British Journal of Educational Psychology, 32 (February, 1962), 66-71.

Lovell, K., C. Byrne, and B. Richardson. "A Further Study of the Educational Progress of Children Who Had Received Remedial Instruction." British Journal of Educational Psychology, 33 (February, 1963), 3-9.

Mouly, G. J. and Virginia Grant. "A Study of Growth to be Expected of Retarded Readers." Journal of Educational Research, 49 (February, 1956), 461-465.

New Jersey State Department of Education. New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1976. 1976, 11-13.

_____. Achievement in Basic Skills Improvement in 1981. April, 1981.

Olandt, Eric and Margaret Hoppe. New Jersey ESEA Title I Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 1978. New Jersey State Department of Education, Summer, 1980, 16-20.

Preston, Ralph C. and David J. Yarington. "Status of Fifty Retarded Readers Eight Years After Reading Clinic Diagnosis." Journal of Reading, 11 (November, 1967), 122-129.

Rawson, Margaret. Developmental Language Disability: Adult Accomplishments of Dyslexic Boys. Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins Press, 1968.

Robinson, Helen M. and Helen K. Smith. "Reading Clinic Cases - Ten Years After, "Elementary School Journal, 63 (October, 1962), 22-27.

Spache, George D. Diagnosing and Correcting Reading Disabilities. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.,1976, 325-342.

Steirnagle, Edward. "A Five-Year Summary of a Remedial Reading Program." Reading Teacher, 24 (March, 1971), 537-543.

STUDENT PROFILE

NAME _____ GRADE (ORIGINAL) _____

GRADE (PRESENT) _____

YEAR	PROGRAM PLACEMENT	REPORT CARD READING GRADE	ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORE - READING		
			VOCAB.	COMP.	TOTAL
1978-79					
1979-80					
1980-81					
1981-82					
1982-83 (present)					